UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,074	11/25/2003	Chin-Yi Lin	LIE 177	4198

7590   05/03/2006

RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
Suite 500
1101 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER
FLEURANTIN, JEAN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/720,074	LIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JEAN B. FLEURANTIN	2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 November 2003*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 November 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/25/03*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This is in response to the application filed on 11/25/03, in which claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

2.   The documents (status request 7/9/05 and 1/13/06) have been considered.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/25/03. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

4.   The Examiner accepts the drawings (11/23/03).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,505,192 issued to Godwin et al., ("Godwin") in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0054807 issued to Harvey et al., ("Harvey").

As per claim 1, Godwin discloses "a searching method for a Security Policy Database" (i.e., Ipsec

processing (searching) in a security policy database; see col. 5, lines 42-45) comprising:

"building a set of peer-based Security Policy Database composed of a plurality of peer-based

Security Policy Databases" (i.e., network security processing multiple nodes (databases) by accepting

packets with Ipsec; see col. 5, lines 29-40 and Fig. 1);

"searching the peer table so as to obtain a corresponding peer-based Security Policy Database"

(i.e., locating the applicable security association into a hash table; see col. 6, lines 47-60); and

"searching the corresponding peer-based Security Policy Database so as to obtain a security

policy" (i.e., searching the IP to determine the applicable security association (security policy); see col. 6,

lines 47-62). Godwing fails to explicitly disclose building or constructing a peer table. However, Harvey

discloses building or constructing a peer table (see Harvey [0005 and 0025]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the teachings of Godwing by building the peer table as disclosed by Harvey (see Harvey

[0254 and 0255]). Such a modification would allow the teachings of Godwing to provide data to be

uniformly diffused over all the participants in the peer-to-peer system (see Harvey [0138, lines 5-7]),

thereby improving the performance and manageability of the searching method for a security policy

database.

As per claim 2, in addition to claim 1, Godwing fails to explicitly disclose the step of building at

least two data in the peer table according to a peer gateway; according to one set of peer gateway, at

least two sets of data are built in the peer table. However, Harvey discloses building at least two data in

the peer table (see Harvey [0025]) according to a peer gateway (see Harvey [0056]); according to one set

of peer gateway (see Harvey [0056]), at least two sets of data are built in the peer table (see Harvey

[0026]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify the teachings of Godwing with building at least two data in the peer table (see Harvey

[0025]) according to a peer gateway (see Harvey [0056]); according to one set of peer gateway (see Harvey [0056]), at least two sets of data are built in the peer table as disclosed by Harvey (see Harvey [0056]). Such a modification would allow the teachings of Godwing to provide data to be uniformly diffused over all the participants in the peer-to-peer system (see Harvey [0138, lines 5-7]), thereby improving the performance and manageability of the searching method for a security policy database.

As per claim 3, in addition to claim 1, Godwing further discloses "one of the two data is an internal network/local area network (LAN) data" (see col. 5, lines 54-56), "the other is an external network/wide area network (WAN) data" (see col. 5, lines 31-34 and Fig. 1); "one of the two sets of data is a set of internal network/local area network (LAN) data and the other is a set of external network/wide area network (WAN) data" (i.e., network interconnecting nodes for sending and receiving (two sets) packet; see col. 5, lines 31-34).

As per claim 4, in addition to claim 1, Godwing further discloses "an address" (se col. 6, lines 35-36), "the address is a network address" (i.e., IP address; see col. 2, line 62); "the type is an internal network/local area network (LAN) section type, an external network/wide area network (WAN) address or both" (i.e., network interconnecting nodes for sending and receiving (two sets) packet; see col. 5, lines 31-34). Godwing fails to explicitly disclose a peer identification, a type and a prefix; the peer identification represents the peer gateway; the prefix is the number of the bits for comparing the address. However, Harvey discloses a peer identification (see Harvey [0232 and 0082]), a type and a prefix (see Harvey [0080]); the peer identification represents the peer gateway (see Harvey [0232]); the prefix is the number of the bits for comparing the address (see Harvey [0415 and 0416]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Godwing with a peer identification, a type and a prefix; the peer identification represents the peer gateway; the prefix is the number of the bits for comparing the address as disclosed by Harvey (see Harvey [0232, 0080 and 0415-0416]). Such a modification would allow the teachings of Godwing to provide data to be uniformly diffused over all the participants in the peer-to-peer

system (see Harvey [0138, lines 5-7]), thereby improving the performance and manageability of the searching method for a security policy database.

As per claim 5, Godwing discloses "the address included in the internal network/local area network (LAN) data is an internal network/local area network (LAN) section" (i.e., network interconnecting nodes for sending and receiving (two sets) packet; see col. 5, lines 31-34).

As per claim 6, Godwing discloses "the address included in the external network/wide area network (WAN) data is an external network/wide area network (WAN) address" (i.e., network interconnecting nodes (WAN) for sending and receiving (two sets) packet; see col. 5, lines 31-34).

As per claim 7, in addition to claim 4, Godwing fails to explicitly disclose the peer identification is 0, the address is 0, the type is B, and the prefix is 0. However, Harvey discloses the peer identification is 0, the address is 0, the type is B, and the prefix is 0 (see Harvey [0082], particularly col. 2, lines 9-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Godwing with the peer identification is 0, the address is 0, the type is B, and the prefix is 0 as disclosed by Harvey (see Harvey [0082]). Such a modification would allow the teachings of Godwing to provide data to be uniformly diffused over all the participants in the peer-to-peer system (see Harvey [0138, lines 5-7]), thereby improving the performance and manageability of the searching method for a security policy database.

As per claim 8, in addition to claim 1, Godwing further discloses "a plurality of peer-based Security Policy Databases are built" (i.e., network interconnecting two nodes with Ipsec; see col. 5, lines 29-41). Godwing fails to explicitly disclose the step of building a peer-based Security Policy Database according to a peer gateway for storing a security policy relating to the peer gateway; according to a plurality of peer gateways. However, Harvey discloses of building a peer-based Security Policy Database

(see Harvey [0026]) according to a peer gateway; according to one set of peer gateway for storing a security policy relating to the peer gateway; according to a plurality of peer gateway (see Harvey [0056]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Godwing with step of building a peer-based Security Policy Database according to a peer gateway for storing a security policy relating to the peer gateway; according to a plurality of peer gateways as disclosed by Harvey (see Harvey Fig. 1A). Such a modification would allow the teachings of Godwing to provide data to be uniformly diffused over all the participants in the peer-to-peer system (see Harvey [0138, lines 5-7]), thereby improving the performance and manageability of the searching method for a security policy database.

As per claim 9, in addition to claim 1, Godwing fails to explicitly disclose a step of building a default peer-based Security Policy Database according to a default peer gateway for storing the security policy relating to the default peer gateway. However, Harvey discloses building a default peer-based Security Policy Database (see Harvey [0026]) according to a default peer gateway for storing a security policy relating to the default peer gateway (see Harvey [0056]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Godwing with a step of building a default peer-based Security Policy Database according to a default peer gateway for storing the security policy relating to the default peer gateway as disclosed by Harvey (see Harvey Fig. 1A). Such a modification would allow the teachings of Godwing to provide data to be uniformly diffused over all the participants in the peer-to-peer system (see Harvey [0138, lines 5-7]), thereby improving the performance and manageability of the searching method for a security policy database.

As per claim 10, in addition to claim 8, Godwing further discloses "the selector is a source address or a destination address" (i.e., destination IP address; see col. 2, line 62).

As per claim 11, the limitations of claim 11 are rejected in the analysis of claim 9, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

As per claim 12, in addition to claim 1, Godwing further discloses "a method for adding-in a security policy, the method comprises: adding the security policy in the set of peer-based Security Policy Database according to a selector" (i.e., permitted with Ipsec processing (packet), in a security policy database; see col. 5, lines 42-45).

As per claim 13, Godwing discloses "the selector is a source address or destination address" (i.e., destination IP address; see col. 2, line 62).

As per claim 14, in addition to claim 1, Godwing further discloses "a method for deleting a security policy, the method comprises: deleting the security policy from the set of peer-based Security Policy Database according to a selector" (i.e., denied permitted without Ipsec processing (packet), in a security policy database; see col. 5, lines 42-45).

As per claim 15, Godwing discloses "the selector is a source address or destination address" (i.e., destination IP address; see col. 2, line 62).

As per claim 16, in addition to claim 1, Godwing further discloses "comparing a packet and the peer table" (i.e., matching packet in a security policy database; see col. 5, lines 42-45).

As per claim 17, Godwing discloses "the packet is an inbound IPSec packet in tunnel mode; the comparing step is used for comparing the source address of the outer header of the inbound IPSec packet in tunnel mode" (i.e., outgoing packet and incoming packet to nodes with Ipsec processing determining the matching of packets in a security policy database; see col. 5, lines 29-41) and "the

external network/wide area network (WAN) address of the peer table" (i.e., network interconnecting nodes (WAN) for sending and receiving (two sets) packet; see col. 5, lines 29-34).

As per claim 18, Godwing discloses "the packet is an inbound IPSec packet in transport mode; the comparing step is used for comparing the source address of the inbound IPSec packet in transport mode" (i.e., outgoing packet and incoming packet to nodes with Ipsec processing determining the matching of packets in a security policy database; see col. 5, lines 29-41) and "the external network/wide area network (WAN) address of the peer table" (i.e., network interconnecting nodes (WAN) for sending and receiving (two sets) packet; see col. 5, lines 29-34).

As per claim 19, Godwing discloses "the packet is an inbound IP packet; the comparing step is used for comparing the source address of the inbound IP packet" (i.e., outgoing packet and incoming packet to nodes with Ipsec processing determining the matching of packets in a security policy database; see col. 5, lines 29-41) "with the internal network/local area network (LAN) section of the peer table" (i.e., network interconnecting nodes (WAN) for sending and receiving (two sets) packet; see col. 5, lines 29-34).

As per claim 20, Godwing discloses "the packet is an outbound IP packet; the comparing step is used for comparing the destination address of the outbound IP packet" (i.e., outgoing packet and incoming packet to nodes with Ipsec processing determining the matching of packets in a security policy database; see col. 5, lines 29-41) "with the internal network/local area network (LAN) section of the peer table" (i.e., network interconnecting nodes (WAN) for sending and receiving (two sets) packet; see col. 5, lines 29-34).

As per claim 21, Godwing further discloses "comparing a packet and the peer-based Security Policy Database" (i.e., outgoing packet and incoming packet to nodes with Ipsec processing determining the matching of packets in a security policy database; see col. 5, lines 29-41).

As per claim 22, Godwing discloses "the packet is an inbound IPSec packet in tunnel mode; the comparing step is used for comparing the inner header of the inbound IPSec packet in tunnel mode with the selector of the security policy of the peer-based Security Policy Database" (i.e., determining if an incoming packet contains an authentication header and a security association must be identified to determine how to authenticate the packet and determining if the matching rule requires that Ipsec processing be applied; see col. 6, line 50 to col. 7, line 7 and Figs. 3 and 7).

As per claim 23, Godwing discloses "the packet is an inbound IPSec packet in transport model; the comparing step is used for comparing the header of the inbound IPSec packet in transport mode with the selector of the security policy of the peer-based Security Policy Database" (i.e., determining if an incoming packet contains an authentication header and a security association must be identified to determine how to authenticate the packet and determining if the matching rule requires that Ipsec processing be applied; see col. 6, line 50 to col. 7, line 7 and Figs. 3 and 7).

As per claim 24, Godwing discloses "the packet is an inbound IP packet; the comparing step is used for comparing the header of the inbound IP packet with the selector of the security policy of the peer-based Security Policy Database" (i.e., determining if an incoming packet contains an authentication header and a security association must be identified to determine how to authenticate the packet and determining if the matching rule requires that Ipsec processing be applied; see col. 6, line 50 to col. 7, line 7 and Figs. 3 and 7).

As per claim 25, Godwing discloses "the packet is an outbound IP packet; the comparing step is used for comparing the header of the outbound IP packet with the selector of the security policy of the peer-based Security Policy Database" (i.e., determining if the outgoing packet contains security and determining the match and building the appropriate security header; see col. 9, lines 37-65 and Fig. 8).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,715,081 issued to Attwood et al., relates to networking security.

U.S. Patent No. 6,754,832 issued to Godwing et al., relates to networking security.

U.S. Patent No. 6,988,106 issued to Enderwick et al., relates to security associations.

CONTACT INFORMATION

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to JEAN B. FLEURANTIN whose telephone number is 571-272-4035. The examiner can

normally be reached on 7:05 to 4:35.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where

this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jean Bolte Fleurantin
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
April 25, 2006